



E 458

.4

.K 29

3

Hollinger
pH 8.5
Mill Run F3-1719

*Speech of Hon. Wm. D. Kelley in the Northrop-
Kelley Debate,*

AT SPRING GARDEN INSTITUTE, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28.

PHOTOGRAPHIC REPORT BY D. WOLFE BROWN.

SOME of you would probably be a little offended if I were to address you as "my fellow cats and kittens;" yet I would be justified in doing so by the language employed by my distinguished opponent on the last evening of our discussion, for he told us that we have all been used as simple cats by that cunning old monkey, New England, to take her chestnuts out of the fire— from which I infer that he regards our soldiers away off there in their distant encampments as but poor unsuspecting kittens, who are being used by that old monkey to pluck her chestnuts out of the fire. I had supposed, until I heard this suggestion, that they were there trying to re-establish the unity of our country and the supremacy of our Constitution, and to give again to our flag, in the eyes of all men and nations, the prestige that belongs to it. I had supposed, men of Pennsylvania, that when your fathers made "a more perfect union," in order that, among other blessings, their posterity might enjoy liberty, they worked, for you as well as for the people of New England; and I also supposed that the workingmen of Pennsylvania, who may have found that from their daily labor they cannot lay up capital enough to leave their families above want, have a personal interest in the public lands of this country, which, so far as they lie in Florida, Louisiana, and those States west of the Mississippi, which were carved out of the Louisiana territory, were bought by us or our ancestors with our money, or by the blood of our brothers—that they have such an interest in these public lands as to feel that it were better that the elder born boy of each family should die in the defence of this right than that the old parents and the younger children should be robbed of so beneficent a heritage. I have explained to you that those lands are yours—that you have but to pitch a canvas tent upon the given number of acres, and occupy them for five years, when, at the mere cost of a deed, the Government must give you a written and indefeasible title to them. And yet my friend so overlooked you in his detestation of New England that he can only see her chestnuts in the great conflagration now prevailing.

I believe in an offensive war. I complained of Abraham Lincoln that he did not drive on the war fast enough. I urged him from the time that McClellan's defection from our great cause became apparent to me till he left the command, to make the war aggressive. And in conducting these debates I have been better pleased to take my own field, and to put my friend upon the defensive, than to dance around in any narrow circle that he might be pleased to fashion or prescribe for me.

To the question whether I "approve of any or all of the twenty-three acts of Congress, each having for its object the declared purpose of giving to the negro all the rights, immunities, and privileges which have hitherto been enjoyed by the white man only," I give a partial answer to-night by saying that there are no such laws on the statute book, and asking my friend to point to one such, promising to make a fuller reply to the question when it comes in my way, if he shall have done so. Meanwhile, I protest that there is not such a law on the statute books of this country.

I make these preliminary remarks and add the sad reflection that my friend has at none of our three meetings had a word of condemnation for any Southern Rebel, whether civilian or soldier. Yes, having seen our flag fired upon—our fortifications, our custom houses, our post-offices, our national hospitals, our mints, our territory taken possession of—having heard from the Rebel Secretary of War on the night on which the storming of Sumter was announced at Montgomery, Alabama, that before the then coming first of May the "stars and bars" would float over the Capitol of our country in Washington—having before his view the graves of hundreds of thousands of Americans who have died in this war for the defence of our flag—the gentleman has no word of condemnation for the perpetrators of these crimes, but tells you that he has an "American repugnance to the use of bayonets and the knocking out of men's brains." I am not very fond of it myself; but I confess I had rather put a bayonet through another man than have him put one through me; and, my fellow-citizens, we had reached such a point that we must creep and crawl, and beg from the invaders the privilege to live, or, like Americans indeed, must fight; and it will require more than our creator of the modern

peace party to convince me that in a war of self defence an American has a "repugnance to knocking out the brains" of the invader of his home or country. It is not an "American repugnance." The American people are the most martial people in the world. There is not a man in this whole assemblage, or in the district which I have the honor to represent, who, if a scoundrel should come into his house, insult his wife, and offer outrage to his daughter in his presence, would not brain the miscreant on the spot. The rebels are endeavoring to rob your wives and children of their patrimony and you of your honor; and the gentleman feels and confesses an "American repugnance to pointing a bayonet" at them. I tell you all that I am for war—war right straight forward until every rebel shall have laid down his bayonet; and if he will not lay it down until his brains are knocked out, then I am in favor of knocking them out; because we must have peace, and with that peace we must enjoy possession of every acre and every inch of our country. I do not want to see the war cease as long as there is upon our soil an armed band bearing a foreign flag. My honor and yours is involved in this issue. We are pledged by the memory of our ancestors to overcome the rebel hordes; we are bound by all the hopes of our posterity and of humanity to do it.

The gentleman says he "is not the champion of a defunct administration." Let me ask him whether he believes in the Chicago Platform?

Mr. Northrop. Which one—Lincoln's or the last one?

Judge Kelley. I mean the Fernando Wood platform.

Mr. Northrop. I do not know any such platform.

Judge Kelley. If it is to be regarded as the platform of any man, let it be ascribed to him who had a potent voice in making it, and not to him who was heroically struggling with the multifarious affairs of our distracted country at the time when it was making. I mean that platform which pledges the Democracy to the "Union under the Constitution in the future *as in the past*." For Mr. Buchanan's Administration was part of the past of that party, and the phraseology of that resolution was adopted to delude ignorant and thoughtless men, and lead them to believe that it is a pledge to the maintenance of the Constitution and the country, while in fact it is a pledge that if that party should come into power, the Union and the Constitution will be maintained in 1864 just as they were in 1860, when that party was in power. I have spent two evenings in showing how that was. It was by building up a rebel Confederacy, by arming it and by giving it a navy, and by stripping you of arms; it was finally by surrendering the public property throughout the South, and the larger part of our country to that armed Confederacy. Therefore, the man who stands up for the Chicago platform is bound by those words "as in the past" to vindicate, like the Administration of James Buchanan and Franklin Pierce. Those administrations are a portion of the Democratic party's "past;" and they constitute the last eight years of its "past," and that is the "past" to which the authors of the Chicago platform refer when they limit their pledge of devotion to the Union, by the phrase "in the future as in the past." No man can defend the Chicago platform and its nominees who dissents from James Buchanan's message, which announced to the people of the South, that the loyal man who dare stand by his country and his country's flag, against the secessionists of his sovereign State, would do so at his peril, and in defiance of the Administration of James Buchanan.

I shall come to the Chicago platform by and by, and discuss it fully. My purpose to-night is to go on as I have begun, and when we shall have ascertained the precise position of both parties with reference to the great question of maintaining our country and its Constitution, it will be time enough to go into details about acts of Congress, my votes on particular bills, and other such questions. I did not pronounce the gentleman's questions "metaphysical." I simply said that, by the terms of our agreement, I was not pledged to answer any metaphysical question that he might see fit to propound to me.

I read to you on last Monday evening an article, the 8th of the Constitution of the S. G. C.'s, a secret oath-bound association, and to-night I proceed in pursuance of my argument to show you that the Democratic party—not the masses of the party—God knows there are many honest and unsuspecting members of the party; there are many of them who believe that the party still stands by the doctrines of its fathers; there are many of them who have not had the courage to tear themselves away from the leaders who have long enjoyed their confidence, and of such I do not speak. I speak of the designing leaders, the managers of the party, and I say that it is their object now, as it was in 1860, to dismember the Union; and in this connection I will tell you why my learned friend so assails New England. It is not that he hates his old *alma mater*, Yale College. He took occasion to tell you that I had spent four years in New England. So did he. I happened, however, to spend those years near Bunker Hill, in the State which gave birth to Hancock and Otis, old Sam Adams and John Adams and Warren; while he spent his in the little State that gave birth to both Benedict Arnold and Isaac Toney! I do not mean to say that his residence there affected his political convictions. He was, as I was, a mere boy, or one just stepping over the threshold of manhood. He was there obtaining that education which so adorns his speech. I was there as an humble youth in the workshop, earning my daily bread by my daily labor. And we both came away bettered by the good influences of New England. Connecticut, though she did give birth to two traitors—one who tried to surrender our army, and one who sent twenty-

seven of the finest ships of our navy to a foreign enemy—is as patriotic a State as any in the Union. Why, sir, among the twelve Apostles there was a Judas; and we are not to condemn a State or a section, because it has given birth to a couple of traitors whose names will stand pre-eminent in history for their treason. The gentleman was not hurt by being in New England; he was not poisoned by breathing the air of the State that gave birth to Toney and Arnold. And he does not hate New England; he does but echo the slang of the Southern leaders of his party when he abuses her so. They hope by this means to accomplish a certain result, after they shall have sundered the Union. They endeavor everywhere and by all means to poison the mind of the masses of people against New England. This is not done without an object. They want to grant an armistice, which would result in a surrender to the South. Now that we have fairly whipped the South they wish us to fall down on our knees and crave the slave-masters of that sacred region to give us pardon for having been so bold. Their object is to let the South go in peace, hoping that we can woo her baby-selling and woman-whipping aristocracy to associate with us again by promising that New England shall be put out in the cold or thrown over to a Canadian confederacy. That is the aim. The leaders of that party do not believe that “the laborer is worthy of his hire.” They have no word of denunciation for slavery or the slave-drivers; but for New England, which gives education and wages to every man coming into her borders, by birth or emigration, for free New England with her public schools and social equality, they teem with denunciation.

I shall proceed to show that their purpose is just what I have said—to dismember the Union in the hope of organizing a Union as a great slave empire, based on the sentiment proclaimed by Herschel V. Johnson, in our own Independence Square, at the great Democratic meeting, on the 17th of September, 1856. He then and there said: “The difference between us, gentlemen, is this—we think it better that capital should own its own labor, while you believe that capital should hire its labor.” I charge upon the leaders of the Democratic party a wilful design to degrade the laboring masses of this country by nationalizing slavery. They know the stubborn resistance which New England presents to this object, and therefore they are going through this land deriding New Englanders, and, as my competitor did, denouncing Plymouth Rock and its incidents as “a disgrace to any people,” poisoning the mind of the country in the hope that, by pursuing the course that McClellan pursued while he was at the head of the army—spending money and refusing to advance—they will yet so exhaust the patriotism and energies of the people as to induce them to consent to the arrangement I have indicated.

The section of the Constitution of the S. G. C.'s which I read showed you that there is within that party a secret organization which boasts of five hundred thousand men, and that it is a military organization under the charge of a “supreme commander,” who “shall be commander-in-chief of all military forces belonging to the order in the various States, when called into actual service.” The S. G. C.'s are not organized like the company to which the gentlemen referred, for dress parades, but for active service as fighting men.

And, by the way, I may as well refer to the gentleman's story of the volunteer who turned one way when ordered to go the other, and complained that the company he had thus left had deserted him. While you were recovering from the paroxysm produced by this bit of facetia he inquired whether I admitted that I had left the Democratic party or charged that it had left me. That does not admit of a question; it left me. The men who forced Calhoun's fatal dogmas on the party forced all thinking and honest Democrats to choose between their good principles and evil and dangerous associations. Thus forced to elect, I chose to adhere to my principles, and let those would-be leaders and their pliant followers go where they might. Nor was my decision singular. The masses of the Democracy concurred in it. Look at Maine. The people of Maine by twenty thousand used to be with the Democratic party, but they have just rolled up a majority of nearly twenty thousand for the party with which I co-operate. New Hampshire used to be with the Democratic party by an almost unbroken vote; she was as solid as Berks County. She now as sturdily repudiates the false leaders, principles, and measures of the party. Connecticut used to be a Democratic State. Connecticut now sends to Congress three members belonging to the same party with me, and a fourth (Mr. English) who is denounced by the leaders of his party in Congress because, though nominally a member of their party, he has voted steadily against it on all questions of men and money to carry on the war; and he could not stand up a day in Connecticut unless he did so. New York was an inveterately Democratic State; but her majority against McClellan, I am told by the most knowing men of the State, will be a hundred thousand. Ohio used to be a determinedly Democratic State. Did she not give a majority of one hundred thousand against the “exiled patriot,” Vallandigham. Iowa used to be a Democratic State; but her sons stood with me by the principles of the party, and now, with an overwhelming majority, go with the party that I support. Was not Missouri a Democratic State? She kept old Tom Benton in the United States Senate for thirty consecutive years; yet she is more radical to-day than Massachusetts, and the quarrel of the leading men of the State with Mr. Lincoln was that he has not been radical and rapid enough. Have I not shown that the base element of the party sloughed off from the old platform of principles? It was no mere “corporal's guard” they left behind; but the controlling men and animating principles of the old party—yes, gentle-

men, I again assert that the present corrupt leaders of the Democratic party—left me standing on the principles of Jefferson, Madison, and Jackson.

I will take another test and prove my assertion. Who are the Democratic leaders to-day all over the country? Let us look at our own city. Do you not all know that I have battled politically with my friends Wm. B. Reed, and Josiah Randall, and George M. Wharton, all my life, and with my distinguished friend here, when he was a Whig member of our City Councils? The leaders are not the same; the principles are not the same. Gen. Lewis Cass lives, at least so the newspapers inform me, to give his vigorous dissent to the Chicago platform. Preston King and the great Democrats of New York, George Bancroft, Hannibal Hamlin, George S. Boutwell, and scores of the great leaders of the Democracy of New England—John A. Dix, Daniel S. Dickinson, Benjamin Butler, Grant, Sherman, Farragut—are all Democrats of the old school, but all stand by their country and its flag, and the Administration that is striving to maintain that country and flag. Gentlemen, if my "company" is small, it has, to say the least, some very good soldiers in it. You will not tell me that I need be ashamed of it!

I now turn to the proceedings of the Grand Council of the State of Indiana, at their meeting held on the 16th and 17th of February, 1864. The session closed with a resolution "That the Grand Secretary prepare and publish, in pamphlet form, the address of the Grand Commander, with such part of the proceedings of the Grand Council as may be necessary for the information of the County Temples, and send one copy of said publication to each County Temple."

The Grand Commander begins by addressing his hearers as "Councillors," and in the course of his remarks, says:—

"We are organized for a high and noble purpose, the erection and consecration of Temples to the service of true Republicanism; altars upon which we may lay our hands and hearts with the invocation of the 'God of our Fathers.'" (That is the beginning of one of their oaths.) "Well may we call upon the God of truth, justice, and human rights, in our efforts to preserve what the great wisdom and heroic acts of our Fathers achieved.

"This, my friends, is no small undertaking—requiring patience, fortitude, patriotism, and a self-sacrificing disposition from each and all, *and may require us to hazard life itself*, in support and defence of those great cardinal principles which are the foundation stones of the State and Federal Government."

"To hazard life itself, eh?" Some of the revolvers with which they were to be armed while making the hazard, were seized just as they had got them from New York, into the room of Commander Dodd, at the same time this bitter pamphlet was found.

"The creation of an empire or republic," the Commander continues, "or the reconstruction of the old Union, by brute force, is simply impossible. The liberation of four million blacks and putting them upon an equality with the whites, is a scheme which can only bring its authors into shame, contempt, and confusion; no results of this enterprise will ever be realized beyond the army of occupation."

Is not this, let me ask, precisely the doctrines that my friend has been teaching you: That it is a war to free the blacks, and that we can never do anything in that war—that we cannot coerce the States, or conquer the people of the South?

But let the Commander go on:—

"*There need be no apprehension that a war of coercion will be continued by a Democratic administration, if placed in control of public affairs*, for with the experience of the present one, which has for three years, with the unlimited resources of eighteen millions of people, in men, money, and ships, won nothing but its own disgrace, and probable downfall, it is not likely that another, if it values public estimation, will repeat the experiment."

You, gentlemen, have not known that when you were cheering for victories, you were cheering for the "disgrace" of your country or the administration that presides over it.

But still again to the commander: "If these men be prolonged in power, they must either consent to be content to exercise the power delegated by the people, or, by the gods, they must prove themselves physically the stronger." (They must fight.) "This position is demanded by every true member of this fraternity; honor, life—ay, more than life, the virtue of our wives and daughters demands it; and if you intend to make this organization of any practical value, you will do one of two things—either take steps to work the political regeneration of the party with which we are affiliated, up to this standard, or, relying upon ourselves, determine at once our plan of action.

"It might be asked now, shall men be coerced to go to war, in a mere crusade to free negroes, and territorial aggrandizement? Shall our people be taxed to carry forward a war of emancipation, miscegenation, confiscation, or extermination?"

No; but it shall, Mr. Commander, and will be carried on to defend and maintain the great nation known as the United States.

But still again:—

"It would be the happiest day of my life, if I could stand up with any considerable portion of my fellow-men and say, not another dollar—not another man for this nefarious war. But the views and suggestions of exiled Vallandigham will be of greater consequence to you than

my own. He says to you, the only issue now is *peace or war.*" Vallandigham, like his eminent disciple my friend, has an "American repugnance to bayonets and knocking out people's brains," and he says that "the only issue now is peace or war.") "To the former he is committed, and cannot, will not retract. He tells us not to commit ourselves to men; as well as he loves, and much as he admires the little hero McClellan, he would have the Chicago Convention act with untrammelled freedom. He reasons that the spring campaign will be more disastrous to the Federal armies than those heretofore made. That by July, the increased call for troops, the certainty of a prolonged war, the rottenness of the financial system, defection of border State troops, the spread and adoption of the principles of this organization, will all tend to bring conservative men to one mind."

The commander must have forgotten that we had not McClellan still at the head of the army when he supposed that the spring campaign would be so disastrous, and would drag along so slowly. He did not remember that we had put "real" soldiers at the head of the army. He did not know that Sherman was going right down to Atlanta to take possession of the Southern railroad system. He did not know that Grant was going to hem in Lee's army and the citizens of Petersburg and Richmond, and then let Sheridan go down the Valley, cutting off their last railroad communications, so that in a little while they must surrender just as was done to Grant at Vicksburg and to Banks (who is still not in a gunboat) at Port Hudson.

Gentlemen: these peace Democrats are just as much mistaken when they say that we cannot conquer and repossess our own country, as they were in supposing that Grant and Sherman and Sheridan would not move our columns onward, or Farragut bring his guns into play.

In the gentleman's clamor against New England, he cites the Hartford Convention as an objectionable part of her record.

Do you not know, sir [addressing Mr. Northrop], that in the speech you made this evening you elaborated and approved the doctrines of the Hartford Convention? Do you not know that the men concerned in that movement were the peace men of 1812? Do you not know that they clamored for peace, and urged against the then Democratic Administration every charge that you and the Democratic leaders urge against Abraham Lincoln to-night? Do you not know that in that very portion of their report that you read was embodied the spirit of the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions of 1798, which are indorsed by the Cincinnati Democratic platform of 1856, and were reaffirmed by the Democratic Convention of 1860? It is wonderful that you have failed to perceive all this. At the Chicago Convention, Mr. Long, of Ohio, again offered those resolutions, and they were rejected. Why were they rejected? Because by those resolutions the right of a State that believes her constitutional rights to have been infringed are limited to nullifying the unconstitutional act. Mark you, in 1798 Virginia and Kentucky adopted resolutions defining the jurisdiction of the National Government over the States; and the Kentucky resolutions set forth that if the United States Government should infringe the reserved rights of a State, that State might nullify the objectionable act until its constitutionality could be tried in the Supreme Court. Mr. Alexander Long (whom we voted in Congress to be an unworthy member, and whom we would have expelled, but that the Democratic members sustained him, for praying God that we might never conquer the South) introduced those resolutions at Chicago as an addition to the platform, and the members of the Convention rejected them on the ground that they believed in the doctrine of secession, while the old States Rights resolutions of Kentucky and Virginia limited the remedial right of a State to the nullifying of an act until the Supreme Court could pass on its constitutionality. Those resolutions were not broad enough for the Chicago Convention; they did not assert the right of the South to secede, but did limit the remedial right of a State to the nullification of an unconstitutional law. The members of that Convention knew that the Federal Government had violated no constitutional right of the Southern States, and therefore they would not adopt those resolutions.

Let me now turn to the passage which was read the other evening by my distinguished friend from Dwight's *History of the Hartford Convention*. It is in these words:—

"That acts of Congress in violation of the Constitution are absolutely void, is an undeniable position. It does not, however, consist with the respect and forbearance due from a Confederate State towards the General Government, to fly to open resistance upon every infraction of the Constitution. The mode and energy of the opposition should always conform to the nature of the violation, the intention of its authors, the extent of the injury inflicted, the determination manifested to persist in it, and the danger of delay. But in cases of deliberate, dangerous, and palpable infractions of the Constitution, affecting the sovereignty of a State and liberties of the people, it is not only the right, but the duty, of such a State to interpose its authority for their protection, in the manner best calculated to secure that end. When emergencies occur which are either beyond the reach of the judicial tribunals, or too pressing to admit of the delay incident to their forms, States, which have no common umpire, must be their own judges and execute their own decisions."

It so happens, however, that the States of this Union have a common umpire. My friend has made to-night, and throughout this discussion, so far as he has argued logically, just the

argument contained in the passage I have just read. He tells you that the Southern States went out of the Union because the Northern people said ugly things to them; and he read portions of what had been said. He asked you whether you would not strike a person who called you a liar, implying that the Southern States were right in the course they have taken, because some persons in the North have applied offensive epithets, not, however, such as "mud-sills of society," to them. He contends furiously for "free speech;" while his whole argument in justification of the South and its wicked war is founded on the fact that certain men in New England during a long period of time have thought for themselves, and have said what they thought. He does not point you to a single act of violence on the part of New England, or of any one of the States of New England. His whole complaint is that some of her clergymen and other citizens will think, and will say what they think, and that therefore the South has, to say the least, a thorough palliation, if not a sufficient vindication of her absolute right to go out and make war on us who remain. Is it not so?

When the gentleman denounced the Hartford Convention and its address, he was denouncing his own doctrines. That assemblage of New England gentlemen who, self-appointed, without authority and without power, met and prepared an address, which the gentleman professes to condemn, agreed with him more largely than he is willing to let you know. Did not the gentleman a night or two ago close his speech by denunciations of conscription? Did he not contend that the National Government, by assuming the right to conscript and to manage the militia of the States, is converting the State militia into a standing army? Let me return to the address of the Hartford Convention. I will read from page 358, while he read from page 361 of the same volume; there is but one leaf between the two extracts. The book is Dwight's Hartford Convention.

"The power of dividing the militia of the States into classes, and obliging such classes to furnish by contract or draft, able-bodied men to serve for one or more years for the defence of the frontier, is not delegated to Congress. If a claim to draft the militia for one year for such general object be admissible, no limitation can be assigned to it, but the discretion of those who make the law. Thus, with a power in Congress to authorize such a draft or conscription, and in the Executive to decide conclusively upon the existence and continuance of the emergency, the whole militia may be converted into a standing army, disposable at the will of the President of the United States.

"The power of compelling the militia, and other citizens of the United States, by a forcible draft or conscription, to serve in the regular armies as proposed in a late official letter of the Secretary of War, is not delegated to Congress by the Constitution, and the exercise of it would not be less dangerous to their liberties, than hostile to the sovereignty of the States. The effort to deduce this power from the right of raising armies, is a flagrant attempt to pervert the sense of the clause in the Constitution which confers that right, and is incompatible with other provisions in that instrument. The armies of the United States have always been raised by contract, never by conscription, and nothing now can be wanting to a Government possessing the power thus claimed to enable it to usurp the entire control of the militia, in derogation of the authority of the State, and to convert it by impressment into a standing army."

Are not these identically the suggestions of the gentleman? They are; and I beg him not to tell me, an old Democrat, that it is the Democratic party which stands on the doctrines of Benedict Arnold, of the Peace men of 1812, and the Peace men of the war with Mexico. A true Democrat denounces Arnold as a traitor, regards most of the doctrines of the Hartford Convention as dangerous, and believes that the war with Mexico was a just war. I learned all these things in the Democratic party, and I proclaimed them all through 1844, and at later periods when, long after I had come from New England, I stumped this State in the cause of the Democratic party. But, oh, God! what would the spirit of Thomas Jefferson think, if it could hear these Peace men proclaiming, in his name and in the name of Democracy, the treasonable sentiments of Arnold, the doctrines of the Hartford Convention, and the clamors of the Peace men of the Mexican War?

Here is the book which the gentleman introduced; here is the report from which he read. Now, who made that report? Is New England responsible for it? Did it emanate from any Legislature of New England? Was it made by any official body? No; certain gentlemen who had been elected to different Legislatures, and who held the tenets of the modern Peace Democracy—who were opposed to the war—who were aiding our enemies by embarrassing the Government—appointed a meeting at Hartford, just as Judge Black and Fernando Wood, and a number of peace men appointed a meeting the other day, at the New York Hotel, in the city of New York. They were merely private citizens (though very distinguished ones), and they adopted and published a report. But even they (and the gentleman knows it as well as I do), opposed as they were to the war, did not ask that the war should be stopped. They said that New England's frontier was not protected; that an adequate navy was not provided; that their fishermen and commercial marine were neglected; that their coast and their seaports had no defence, and they asked that New England might be permitted to raise her own taxes and carry on the war, as far as the coast and limits of New England extended, at her own cost and at her own risk. That is what they asked. They did not ask that the

flag should be stricken and furled, and an armistice granted, and that we should try to coax our enemy into consenting "on some terms or other," to let us go without looking at that ugly thing, a bayonet, which it is so un-American to use. Even the members of the Hartford Convention did not so far forget what was due to their manhood as to do that. But the gentleman has assumed all their doctrines, and he must stand by them.

Let me pause to ask what the sentiment of New England really was in regard to the constitutional questions involved in the extract which the gentleman read? The book which I hold in my hand (Elliott's Debate, vol. iv.) contains the answer of every New England State to the Virginia resolutions of 1798. There is the answer of Connecticut, of Massachusetts, of New Hampshire, of Vermont, of Rhode Island. They are all there. I commend them to the gentleman, and I ask him to find in one of them any declaration which does not say that the Union is supreme, which does not repudiate the doctrines both of the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions of 1798, and of the Hartford Convention—which does not put those States thoroughly upon the doctrine of the supremacy of the General Government. And, sir, no one of these States has failed to fill its quota, and to fill it promptly, under any call during this war.

Thus, I have shown, that when the gentleman went to New England to find there all that was, in his judgment, vile—to find all that he might hope would inflame your passions—he was found in the saddest page of her history his own doctrines; when he would point to the most damning fact in her whole record, he held up before you the conduct and opinions of men who, did they still live, and hold the opinions they then did, would rally around him and cheer him for the speeches he is making to-night.

Now, sir, I pass to another point. I am, sir, in favor of maintaining the Monroe Doctrine. But what is the use of talking about the Monroe Doctrine, while between our armies and Mexico, or Central America, lies a proud military Confederacy. We cannot attempt to carry out the Monroe Doctrine until we get Jeff. Davis and his army out of the way. And what is the use of fighting Europe about an abstraction which cannot become practical until we shall have repossessed our country? I turn, sir, and ask you, whether you are in favor of the Monroe Doctrine; and if you say you are, I ask you to explain how the United States Government can enforce the Monroe Doctrine if it permits an alien Confederacy to extend from the Sabine, ay, from the Del Norte to the Potomac. It is my devotion to the Monroe Doctrine that makes me want to see this foreign government that has been set up on our soil kicked into the Gulf. No foreign or stranger power must flout a flag alongside of ours, on the American continent, whether it be the stars and bars of Jeff. Davis, or the lily of France, or the eagle of Austria; and I tell you, my friends, that when we have finished the war in which we are now engaged, the Monroe doctrine must be enforced. When that is to be done, the 127th regiment of U. S. colored troops, that I saw march through the city to-day, with others like it, will be of special value. They are composed of just the kind of men to walk across Central America, for the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine. We of the white race cannot go there. That is a tropical country; it is malarious; and its malaria is fatal to our race. Do you know that so fatal a region is that to the white man, that to construct the railroad across the Isthmus cost seven thousand human lives? Men took the job of working upon it. Their names appeared on the pay-roll for one, two, or three days, and then they disappeared forever—victims to the Chagres fever, as travellers call it. Our enterprising but heartless men, instead of taking negro laborers to make that railroad, because they are opposed to giving the negro wages for his work, pressed on and hired white men until they had laid along the line of that short road the bones of seven thousand human beings. We who are born in the North—we whose skins are white, and who thrive in the cold regions of the world—we who, in the North, live long, carry our teeth well, get many children, cannot live and propagate in that tropical and malarious region. Our race runs out there. But in that region the negro lives long; he carries a head as white as the driven snow, because no snow comes there to chill him; his family is numerous, and he dies with his teeth firmly set in his head. And when we shall have "crushed out" this rebellion, these black soldiers of ours will take the American flag in their hands, and sweep across that to us pestilent region, and drive the Austrian cousin of the august Emperor of France into the ocean or on to a "gunboat," and maintain, in the name of the American people, the Monroe doctrine. But they, with the other soldiers of our army, must first annihilate the army of Jefferson Davis, which enjoys in so eminent a degree the sympathy of my friend, because the New England people made faces at the Southern people and called them ugly names. Yes, I am in favor of the Monroe doctrine, of preventing all foreign interference in this country, and so are you, my honest Democratic fellow citizens; and you will overwhelm your leaders with indignant contempt, when you come to fairly and fully understand what they have been and are now doing.

Now let us turn to the letter of Lord Lyons to Earl Russell, respecting mediation. It is an official communication from the English Minister to his Government. It is dated Washington, November 17th, 1862—two years ago the coming 17th of November.

Lord Lyons writes:—

"In his despatches of the 17th and 24th ultimo, and of the 17th instant, Mr. Stuart reported

to your lordship the result of the elections for members of Congress and State officers, which have recently taken place in several of the most important States of the Union. Without repeating the details, it will be sufficient for me to observe that the successes of the Democratic, or (as it now styles itself) the conservative party, has been so great as to manifest a change in public feeling, among the most rapid and the most complete that has ever been witnessed in this country.

"On my arrival at New York, on the 8th instant, I found the conservative leaders exulting in the crowning success achieved by the party in the State. They appeared to rejoice, above all, in the conviction that personal liberty and freedom of speech had been secured for the principal State of the Union. They believed that the Government must at once desist from exercising in the State of New York the extraordinary (and as they regarded them) illegal and unconstitutional powers which it had assumed. They were confident that at all events after the 1st of January next, on which day the newly-elected Governor would come into office, the suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus* could not be practically maintained."

Mark you, Democrats, Lord Lyons informed his Government that the Democratic leaders believed that Horatio Seymour would bring on a collision between the State of New York and the General Government, rather than permit the Government to do that which I have shown you General Jackson did, and by vindicating the constitutionality of which Douglas made his fame. And they talk about being Democrats and patriots.

His Lordship continues:—

"On the following morning, however, intelligence arrived from Washington which dashed the rising hopes of the Conservatives. It was announced that General McClellan had been dismissed from the command of the Army of the Potomac, and ordered to repair to his home; that he had, in fact, been removed altogether from active service. *The General had been regarded as the representative of conservative principles in the army.*"

"The General had been regarded as the representative of conservative principles in the army,"—when "conservative principles" meant opposition to the suspension of the *habeas corpus* and similar exertions of constitutional power! Was he cheating the Democratic leaders, or was he cheating the Government and the country? We looked upon him as the head of our army—as one who was striving to lead it to victory; but the Democratic *peace* leaders who were in confidential relations with him looked upon him as their "representative" in the army!

Again, his Lordship says: "Support of him had been made one of the articles of the Conservative electoral programme. His dismissal was taken as a sign that the President had thrown himself entirely into the arms of the extreme radical party, and that the attempt to carry out the policy of that party would be persisted in. The irritation of the Conservatives at New York was certainly very great; it seemed, however, to be not unmingled with consternation and despondency."

I do not wonder at it; for they saw that when he was removed, it was probable that his place would be filled by a General who would represent the United States and not the Democratic *Peace* party. In such a change they found full cause for their "consternation and despondency."

But again: "Several of the leaders of the Democratic party sought interviews with me, both before and after the arrival of the intelligence of General McClellan's dismissal. The subject uppermost in their minds, while they were speaking to me, was naturally that of foreign mediation between the North and South."

Here we see the leaders of the Democratic party creeping to the feet of the British minister, to talk of foreign mediation. Are you, sir, and are these your political brethren in favor of the Monroe doctrine?

But to his Lordship again: "Many of them seemed to think that this mediation must come at last, but they appeared to be very much afraid of its coming too soon. It was evident that they apprehended that a premature proposal of foreign intervention would afford the Radical party a means of reviving the violent war spirit, and of thus defeating the peaceful plans of the Conservatives."

Gentlemen, do you not agree with me in thinking that if the citizens of this country, especially the honest Democrats, had known that the Democratic leaders were with Lord Lyons, trying to get his Government to straighten us up, by dividing our country, it would have "revived the radical spirit" a little, and possibly at the cost of some of those leaders?

"They," says his Lordship, "appeared to regard the present moment as peculiarly unfavorable for such an offer, and indeed to hold that it would be essential to the success of any proposal from abroad, that it should be deferred until the control of the Executive Government should be in the hands of the Conservative party."

They pledge themselves to Lord Lyons that when the Government should come into their hands Great Britain should have her way about dividing our country; but they thought it would not be judicious to make the proposition at that time. "Wait," said they, "till the Government comes into the hands of the Conservative party"—the party of my friend here and of General McClellan, and of that eminent conservative, George H. Pendleton, who has never voted a man or a dollar for the prosecution of this war.

"I gave no opinion," says Her Majesty's minister, when reporting the part he took in this council of Democratic leaders, "on the subject. I did not say whether or no I myself thought foreign intervention probable or advisable, but I listened with attention to the accounts given me of the plans and hopes of the conservative party. *At the bottom I thought I perceived a desire to put an end to the war, even at the risk of losing the Southern States altogether.*"

I am going to prove his lordship was not mistaken, and that is what they mean, viz: to let the Southern States go. I ask my friend, what value the Monroe doctrine would have for us, after we had let the Southern States go? What interest we would have in the Monroe doctrine, with a foreign military Confederacy sweeping from the Potomac to the Rio Grande?

"But," continues his lordship, "it was plain that it was not thought prudent to avow this desire. *Indeed, some hints of it, dropped before the election, were so ill received that a strong declaration in the contrary sense was deemed necessary by the Democratic leaders.*"

I pray you, my Democratic fellow-citizens, mark the course of your leaders when in secret council. It proves that they do not tell you what they believe; that they only tell you what they think will induce you to give them power and follow their fortunes. While with Lord Lyons, they were willing to make peace and let the South go; but, on sounding the pulse of the people, and finding that such a doctrine was unpopular, they announced, as you know, that if you would put the Government in their hands, they would carry on the war more vigorously than we had done. It was when they had determined on this system of fraud and duplicity that they started the lies with which their addresses and papers thenceforth teemed; that the Government had embarrassed McClellan, and would not give him all the men it could; that the Democrats were anxious to bring the war to a successful close, but the Government would not let them, because the war was a profitable thing for "shoddy" and other contractors, etc. You remember all this as well as I do, especially you who attended Democratic meetings or read the journals of that party. But let me finish with his Lordship's despatch.

"*At the present moment, therefore, the chiefs of the Conservative party call loudly for a more vigorous prosecution of the war, and reproach the Government with slackness as well as with want of success in its military measures. But they repudiate all idea of interfering with the institutions of the Southern people, or of waging a war of subjugation or extermination. They maintain that the object of the military operations should be to place the North in a position to demand an armistice with honor and effect. The armistice should, they hold, be followed by a convention,*" (thus two years ago you find these Democratic leaders announcing just what should be the platform of the Chicago Convention—an armistice with a view to a convention)—"*in which such change of the Constitution should be proposed as would give the South ample security on the subject of its slave property, and would enable the North and South to re-unite and live together in peace and harmony. The Conservatives profess to think that the South might be induced to take part in such a convention, and that a restoration of the Union would be the result.*"

"The more sagacious members of the party must, however, look upon the proposal of a convention merely as a last experiment to test the possibility of re-union. They are, no doubt, well aware that the more probable consequence of an armistice would be the establishment of Southern independence, but they perceive that if the South is so utterly alienated that no possible concessions will induce it to return voluntarily to the Union, it is wiser to agree to separate than to prosecute a cruel and hopeless war."

Let me borrow the language of my friend's seventh interrogation, and ask whether you are "In favor of the non-intervention of foreign powers on this continent, known as the Monroe Doctrine," or are you ready to crawl with the leaders of the Peace Democracy to the feet of the British lion, and ask its intervention with the affairs not only of the continent but of our own dear country, whose fathers fought that lion eight long years? Are you ready to see this country, which, united, can defy and conquer the world on land or sea, divided, that while England fights one-half of it, France, with its Austrian Emperor in Mexico, may fight the other half? If you are not, I beg you in the name of God and your country to abandon the Democratic leaders, who are treating with Lord Lyons and the titled representatives of other powers of the continent with reference to the division of our country by an armistice and the delusive promise of a convention, which they know can never be had. A people who, having rebelled and fought us for four years, and right on the eve of our final victory, have been granted all they asked, will not make terms with a people whom they would have so good reason to despise as fools, cowards, or traitors. If we withdraw our forces from Atlanta, from Petersburg, from the Shenandoah Valley, and old Farragut from the front of Mobile, and our fleet from the front of Charleston, and our forces from Louisiana, if we surrender to the Southern rebel the free State of West Virginia—if we surrender to them Kentucky, whose people, though they for a time occupied a position of neutrality, are now fighting grandly for the old flag—if we surrender Andrew Johnson and the people of East Tennessee to the Southern rebels—could they have respect for or confidence in us? Why, when we have done thus much they will make us pay for every slave they have lost, and assume their war debt, too. They would threaten us with the dreaded "bayonet" if we did not do all this, and do it promptly—and they would have the right to make these demands, for such a surrender would

be a confession that we have been wrong in defending our country, and they right in assailing it. Certain it is that they will never come into council with us after we have granted them an armistice, and begged their pardon for having defended our nationality and flag.

Gentlemen, I may be very prosy; but I cannot help that! My wish is to make a chain of argument, and weave it together with facts which you all know, which none of you can dispute. I must, therefore, still pursue my own method rather than that suggested by my competitor.

Now for the first resolution of the Chicago platform. It reads thus:—

Resolved, That in the future, as in the past, we will adhere with unswerving fidelity to the Union under the Constitution, as the only solid foundation of our strength, security, and happiness as a people, and as a framework of government equally conducive to the welfare and prosperity of all the States, both Northern and Southern."

I reiterate what I have already said, that, in order to understand this declaration, you must refer to what the Democratic party has done in the past. Designing men and their dupes contend that this resolution is a pledge that the party will support the Union. Gentlemen, did you ever see a three-sided sign, which, as you walk one way, exhibits one name, and as you walk another way, displays another, and, when you stand in front of it, shows still another. I have often seen such; there used to be several of them in this city. This resolution is like one of those signs. To the Southern man it reads "the right of secession;" to the unsuspecting Northern Democrat, who goes with the party because he has always belonged to it, it reads "the Union;" and when you are right in front of it, as my friend and the Chicago managers are, it reads "State Sovereignty."

To a simple, unsuspecting man, this declaration is, on its face, a pledge of fidelity to the Union. Coupled as it is with the words, "as in the past," it is a pledge to every Southern States rights man that the party adheres to the doctrines which induced Buchanan and his cabinet to allow the Southern rebels to construct fortifications around our forts, make prisoners of our regular army, rob us of our arms, and go out of the Union, without an effort at resistance on the part of the administration.

"But," says my friend, "what could Mr. Buchanan have done?" Why, he could have sent the arms all North instead of sending them all South; he could have armed all the forts in front of Southern cities, instead of leaving them without armament; he could have put Twiggs and Canby, with their armies, north of the slave States, and had them ready to threaten to descend upon the insurgents, instead of putting them where they could be taken prisoners without any trouble. Indeed, Twiggs handed his troops over of his own accord. Mr. Buchanan could have sent into Congress Jackson's proclamation to the Nullifiers, adding a little post-script, saying, "I say ditto to General Jackson"—just as, in the English Parliament, a member, unable to compose a speech, but desirous to make a "splurge," followed one of Mr. Burke's eloquent addresses with the words "I say ditto to Mr. Burke!" If James Buchanan could not find in the Constitution anything to justify him in maintaining the Union, he could have taken General Jackson's proclamation to the people of South Carolina, and sent it into Congress, saying, "I believe every doctrine expressed in this great state paper, and will act under like circumstances as General Jackson would have acted," instead of sending a message which conveyed a threat to the poor Union people of the South that if they dared to stand up to the country and their rights he would abandon them to the tender mercies of their man stealing and woman-whipping neighbors. That is what he could have done; and had he done this, or asserted a determination to do it, there would not have been war. But for the course of certain Northern men who pledged themselves to sustain the South in secession and to let her go in peace—but for the course of Mr. Buchanan's Administration in arming and fortifying the rebels, in depriving us of soldiers and giving them a navy—they never would have undertaken the work of breaking up the Union. If we had had a patriot in the Presidential chair, instead of James Buchanan, this war would not have desolated our homes and burdened us with taxes. No man who will take up the plank of the Chicago platform, which I have read, and study it in the light of history, and ask who is to construe the Constitution, if McClellan be elected, will doubt its meaning, if the Democracy get into power. They will take their own view of it—won't they? Well, what is Mr. Pendleton's view? Mr. Pendleton was in Congress during the whole of Buchanan's Administration. He made a speech defending James Buchanan's message and denying the right of the Federal Government to coerce a State. He is as fully committed to secession as Jefferson Davis himself; and in proof of this I refer you to the columns of the *Globe* throughout the eight years that he has been in Congress. He is an open and avowed secessionist; he does not deny it. The convention that nominated him dare not ask him for a formal acceptance of the nomination. The convention appointed a committee to apprise the candidates of their nomination; and that committee have never yet addressed a line to Mr. Pendleton, because they know what his answer would be—that he would reply "that he accepts the platform which is perfectly consistent with his entire Congressional record." That would be his answer, and the men of that Convention, who are playing a double game, are afraid to draw that answer forth. When did Voorhees—when did either of the Woods—when did Alexander Long, of Ohio—when did the Democratic representative from Berks County, Mr. Ancona, or the representative from the Democratic

county of Northampton, Mr. Johnson, or from Montgomery and Lehigh, Mr. Stites, or any of the other leading Democratic members from this State, ever vote for a dollar or a man to sustain this war? They are for peace. They believe in the right of the Southern States to secede and carry with them our patrimony. They know how the Democratic party preserved the Union *in the past*.

I now, as my time is nearly expended, pass to the third plank of the Chicago platform; but let me first remind you that I have read you an article from the Constitution of the Sons of Liberty or the Knights of the Golden Circle, and extracts from a speech of the Grand Commander of the order. I now proceed to show that one object of the Chicago platform was to indorse and encourage that arming of people to assail us at the polls. The third resolution reads thus:—

“*Resolved*, That the direct interference of the military authority of the United States in the recent elections held in Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, and Delaware was a shameful violation of the Constitution, and the repetition of such acts in the approaching election will be held as revolutionary, and resisted with all the means and power under our control.”

Who perpetrated the acts thus denounced in Maryland—who issued the order of October, 1861, which I read to you on the last evening of this discussion—but the very man whom they have placed on their platform? Geo. B. McClellan, in October, 1861, ordered his troops to arrest any man of a certain description who might *show himself at the polls*. Yet the Convention denounces those acts as “revolutionary,” and “a shameful violation of the Constitution,” and pledges the Democratic party to resist a repetition of them “with all the means and power under their control,” and are going around denouncing the suspension of the *habeas corpus*, and talking in vague and unmeaning terms about the unconstitutional acts, the tyranny, and the oppression of Abraham Lincoln. Do they point out one tyrannical or unconstitutional act? No, not one. They are trying to inflame the passions and extinguish the patriotism of the people, so as to induce them to make a scene of riot and carnage on election day; and they demand that all troops shall be removed from the Northern States, that they may execute their fiendish purpose with impunity. As Lord Lyons could write to his Government, on the 17th of November, 1862, what the Chicago platform of 1864 was to be, so the Sons of Liberty, who pledge themselves to lay down their lives, and began buying arms, understood what the platform was to be, and they understand what the game is to be.

The object of these conspirators is to surrender to a foreign Confederacy half of our country, and then they hope to carry one State after another into that Confederacy, so that free, intelligent, wages-paying New England, with its undying hatred of human slavery, shall be left out of the new organization. I am against the whole scheme. I am heir to the honors and glories of every Revolutionary battle that was fought in the Southern States. They are heirlooms belonging to me and my posterity. My forefathers were soldiers in the Revolutionary War, and all its honors belong to me in common with the people of this country. Bunker Hill and Lexington belong to me and to you; and while I am unwilling to let them take Eutaw or Camden out of the Union, I am also unwilling to let them, by denunciation or chicanery, put Bunker Hill or Lexington from under the flag of my country. It is all ours. The men of the South and the men of New England tracked with their blood the snows of Valley Forge with our Pennsylvania fathers. It is all, all our country; and we have but to stand by President Lincoln and the war, and our children will inherit it all.

The gentleman said the other night that all wars end by negotiations, treaty, and compromise. Yes, all international wars do, but it is not true of civil wars. If it were so, every rebellion that ever has occurred would have ended in the division of one country into two. But rebellions are generally put down. Texas achieved her independence of Mexico; but Ireland has never been able to achieve her independence of England. Poor Kossuth could not achieve the independence of Hungary. Hungary was put down. Poland has never been able to achieve her independence of Russia. Insurrections and rebellions are put down. People love their country. They may complain of their institutions. I gave Poland my sympathy in the days of my youth. I gave Hungary my sympathy; and one of the proudest testimonials of my life is an autograph letter from Louis Kossuth, thanking me for what I had done for Hungary. I had argued her cause as my friend tells us Abraham Lincoln argued the case of Texas, when her people and our friends who had gone there were striking for freedom against the Mexican despotism and misrule. I ask you to give Abraham Lincoln credit for the good words my friend read to you, and remember that they were uttered in favor of the Texan people enjoying a free American constitution, instead of being recommitted to the despotism of distant and misgoverned Mexico.

Yes, rebellions are generally put down; and this one will be put down. The Chicago Convention pronounced our war a failure. They lied in the throat when they said so. No nation has ever conquered so much territory in the same time. Members of the Democratic party have told us on the floor of Congress and through their newspapers, that we never can conquer an agricultural people of twelve millions, living on their own soil. Are we not doing it rapidly, thoroughly? I first saw the rebel stars and bars across the Susquehanna, floating over most of the houses of the little town of Havre de Grace. At that time, Ben. Butler, whom my friend so loathes, had to take his troops down the Susquehanna, and around by An-

napoleon to send them to Washington to defend the Capital. We have meanwhile conquered Maryland, and her people are freer, happier, and more prosperous than they ever were before. A Republican or an Abolitionist is no longer in danger there, but may think and speak freely. I have discussed the issues of the day and maintained the right of every laborer to wages in the large counties of Maryland, to audiences in which whites and blacks, slaves and slave owners, were mingled like the squares of a checker-board; and the man who speaks most of freedom, and shows most plainly the curse of slavery, is most welcome in that region as an orator. We hold West Virginia, and it is a free State, no longer held, as England holds Ireland, or Austria holds Hungary, by the slave-driving aristocrats of East Virginia. It is a free State, and the people govern themselves. They know by terrible experience the despotism from which they have escaped. Why, under the law of the old State, when men and women were selling at \$2000 per head, they were by law assessed as worth only three hundred dollars; and when you could sell a babe in the hour of its birth, if the doctor pronounced it healthy, for \$100, the dealers in human flesh being the ruling power of the State, would not allow it to be taxed at all until it came to be twelve years of age. The brutal aristocracy controlling the State taxed the pig of the farmer in West Virginia; they taxed his horses, his plough; they taxed his industry in every shape; but by statute they reduced their slave property to less than one-sixth of its value before they allowed the assessor to come near it. There stands West Virginia, a free State to-day—as the gentleman would say, a “sovereign State”—with her three Union members of Congress and her two Union Senators. I know that the gentleman does not like it, because it proves that the Administration and its friends are ready to destroy the Union. It was for this reason that the delegates from West Virginia were refused seats in the Chicago Convention.

Let me ask my Democratic hearers whether, if half the people of a State, covering half its territory, want to come back into the Union, we must say, “No, you must wait till those traitors who have involved us all in war, are ready to come with you.” The people of West Virginia wanted to come in. They had a territory nearly as large as half our State, much larger than Maryland, and we welcomed them. They rejoice in their subjugation, and are devoted to Union and freedom. Kentucky had as duly elected members of the last House, Green Clay, Smith, William H. Randall, and Julian Anderson, and they voted with me every time. If I voted for the twenty-three acts which the gentleman has referred to, I did it in company with these three Kentuckians, and the members from Maryland (except my competitors, Wend. Mr. Harris) and the members from West Virginia, and the majority of members from Missouri.

But I deny that there are any such acts on the statute book. We passed acts touching the negro, but none of the kind described by the gentleman’s question.

We have also conquered Missouri, though the rebels are again threatening her borders. We have a pretty broad foothold in Arkansas. We have ransacked the residence of Jeff Davis, and found there the letter of Franklin Pierce, declaring that if the South should secede and a war begin, it would not be confined to the South, but would extend to our own cities, our own towns, our own villages. You remember that letter, for it has been published broadcast. It corresponded with the tenor of Mr. Buchanan’s message, and assured the Southern States that they could go out without fear of resistance.

Arkansas is in Mississippi, and we took it with a garrison of thirty-one thousand men. We have taken a lodgment that enables us to protect the freedom of the Mississippi for a thousand miles. We have opened that river. This and the conquest of all the territory along either side of that river for that immense distance is a work the like of which was never achieved by any nation in a war of less than four years. We hold the commercial frontiers of Louisiana, and command the commerce of the Gulf. We can march through Florida any day we want to. We are teaching the loyal people on the coast of South Carolina and the Sea Islands to read the Lord’s Prayer and the Constitution of the United States, tools which they were never permitted before. We hold so much of North Carolina that those of her people who resist the rebel conscription, and the deserters from their army can rally to the number of seventeen hundred and drive Jeff Davis’s minions from their front. On the coast we could get it to them, would float over their citadel, and it will not be long till we get it to them. We hold Norfolk, and have got back the navy yard where were burned many of the magnificent vessels which Floyd surrendered to the embryo Confederacy. We have made the American flag the proudest in the world, and have taught England and France that if we can do so much during a civil war, we shall, when we are again one people, be invincible against the world united. Our future is a proud one surely!

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 012 047 368 2

Collins, Printer, 705 Jayne St.

Price per 100 copies \$2.00

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 012 047 368 2

